



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,320	03/16/2004	Alex Fung	CHEUNG/118/US	3743
2543	7590	09/07/2005	EXAMINER	
ALIX YALE & RISTAS LLP 750 MAIN STREET SUITE 1400 HARTFORD, CT 06103			NGUYEN, CHAU N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2831	
DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/802,320	Applicant(s) FUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner Chau N. Nguyen	Art Unit 2831	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7-9,12-15,18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,6,10,11,16,17 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 14, 15, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wijnberg et al. (6,297,455) in view of Nudd et al. (2005/0124200).

Wijnberg et al. discloses a power and signal transmitting multiple-core cable in which power transmitting core (20) has more conductors and thicker insulation than two signal transmitting cores (30). Wijnberg et al. does not disclose the cable having an attachment plug which has metal plug-pins with recesses on a plug body near the plug-pins. Nudd et al. discloses an attachment plug (Figure 4) comprising metal plug-pins and a plug body (27) with recesses (14, 15) provided near the plug-pins. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to attach the plug taught by Nudd et al. to the cable of Wijnberg et al. to provide an electrical connection between the cable and an electronic device. Noted that the modified cable assembly of Wijnberg et al. can be used for an electrosurgical pencil since it comprises structure and material as claimed (re claims 1 and 14).

The modified cable assembly of Wijnberg et al. also discloses the two signal transmitting cores having a reduced diameter in comparison to the power transmitting core (re claims 2 and 15), and the recess being a notch cut on a ridge of the plug body near the plug-pins (re claims 5 and 18). Re claims 7 and 20, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use only four conductors in each of the signal core of Wijnberg et al. to meet the specific use of the resulting cable since it is known in the art that the transmission capacity of a conductive core depends on its diameter.

4. Claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wijnberg et al. in view of Nudd et al. as applied to claims above and further in view of Okamoto et al. (6,146,211).

The combination of Wijnberg et al. and Nudd et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the plug-pins being plastic plug-pins each with a spring-steel strip. Okamoto et al. discloses a plastic plug-pin with a metal strip (Figure 3a). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the pin as taught by Okamoto et al. for the pins (of Nudd et al.) in the modified cable assembly of Wijnberg et al. to provide a safety means (col. 2, lines 43-48).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 16, 17 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8 and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau N. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 31. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/802,320
Art Unit: 2831

Page 6

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chau N Nguyen". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending from the end.

Chau N Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2831